

THE PROCEEDINGS  
*of*  
THE SOUTH CAROLINA  
HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

1947

---

CONTENTS

The Seventeenth Annual Meeting .....	2
William Gilmore Simms—Almost a Historian.....	3
HAMPTON M. JARRELL	
United States Aggrandizement, 1850-1860—The Walker Expeditions as an Illustrative Case.....	9
WILLIAM H. PATTERSON	
Xenophobia in the South.....	21
G. A. BUCHANAN, JR.	
Constitution .....	36
Members of the Association .....	37

## OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION, 1947-1948

*President*.....J. HAROLD WOLFE, Winthrop College  
*Vice-President*.....LILLIAN KIBLER, Converse College  
*Secretary-Treasurer*.....THOMAS B. ALEXANDER, Clemson College

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

(In addition to the officers named above)

CHARLES E. CAUTHEN, Wofford College

ROBERT H. WIENEFELD, University of South Carolina  
*Editor of The Proceedings*

ROBERT D. OCHS, University of South Carolina



The South Carolina Historical Association supplies *The Proceedings* to all its members. The Executive Committee elects the Editor. Beginning with 1935, every fifth number contains an index for the preceding five years. The price of *The Proceedings* to persons not members of the Association is \$1.00 per copy. Orders should be sent to the Secretary-Treasurer, 1200 Henderson St., Columbia, S. C.

THE PROCEEDINGS  
*of*  
THE SOUTH CAROLINA  
HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

1947

---

ROBERT D. OCHS  
*Editor*

---

COLUMBIA  
THE SOUTH CAROLINA  
HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION  
1947



## THE SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING

The seventeenth annual meeting of the South Carolina Historical Association was held at the Wade Hampton Hotel in Columbia, April 12, 1947. W. H. Callcott, President of the Association, presided.

At the afternoon session two papers were read. Professor Hampton M. Jarrell read his paper on "William Gilmore Simms—Almost a Historian." Discussion of this paper was led by Professor A. T. Odell. Professor W. H. Patterson read the second paper on "United States Aggrandizement, 1850-1860—The Walker Expeditions as an Illustrative Case."

The annual business session was held immediately following the afternoon session. The Treasurer's report was read and accepted. Officers chosen for 1947-1948 were: President, J. Harold Wolfe; Vice-President, Lillian Kibler; Secretary-Treasurer, Thomas B. Alexander; Executive Committee Member, Robert H. Wienefeld.

At the evening banquet session, George A. Buchanan, Jr., Editor of the *Columbia Record*, addressed the Association on "Xenophobia in the South."

The Executive Committee met and selected Robert D. Ochs as editor of *The 1947 Proceedings* of the Association. The Committee designated Clemson College as the place for the Association's 1948 meeting.



WILLIAM GILMORE SIMMS—ALMOST A  
HISTORIAN

HAMPTON M. JARRELL

## I

Perhaps one could demand for William Gilmore Simms the title of historian without the qualifying *almost*. If so, his claim would rest on his life-long interest in the past of his state and on his sustained endeavor to find out about that past and to record it so that others might learn. Abundant evidence of his antiquarianism may be found in such works as his child's history of South Carolina (written for his oldest daughter but still, after various revisions, used by the public schools of the state), his biographies of Francis Marion, Captain John Smith, Chevalier Bayard, and Nathanael Green, his volume of sketches about the Huguenots, his *South Carolina in the Revolutionary War*, his "Memoir of Colonel John Laurens," and his numerous historical articles, sketches, and critical reviews of contemporary historical works, written for various newspapers and magazines. Much of this material was, of course, the mere gossip of history, but some of it was carefully compiled and documented.

Although Simms' historical writings evidence a wide range of interest, they clearly reveal a particular concern with the story of his own state, notably with the Revolutionary history of South Carolina, and most particularly with the guerilla warfare that was characteristic of the period from the capture of Charleston by the British in the summer of 1780 to the evacuation of that city in the winter of 1782. If Simms had decided to make a serious bid for the ancient and honorable title of *historian*, it seems likely that his monumental work would have been a history of partisan warfare in South Carolina. Instead of such a work, however, he wrote seven historical romances on the same subject, a group of novels that constitute his best literary work. In other words, Simms was *almost* a historian because he chose fiction rather than orthodox history to tell his most important story. This paper is an investigation of that choice.

## II

If Simms did make a conscious choice between history and fiction, the question arises, Why did he choose fiction? Part of the answer to this question is obvious: he had a living to make, and then, as now, *Clio* for all her virtues was not a very generous paymaster.

To believe, however, that money was Simms' only reason, or even his most important one, is to do him less than justice. The very nature of Simms' material made formal historical treatment extremely difficult. Much that he knew about partisan warfare in South Carolina came from

oral tradition. "From an ancient grand-dame," said Simms in an article in *The Literary World*, "at an early period, I had my mind thoroughly imbued, not only with the incidents of the war, but with a decided passion for their study."<sup>1</sup> In the "Introduction" to *The Partisan* Simms alludes to another oral source for a "large body of revolutionary and traditional history";<sup>2</sup> and Simms' biographer, William P. Trent, asserted that the novelist "had conversed with old men who had served under 'the Swamp Fox'."<sup>3</sup> This mass of traditional material was ideal for the romancer but of little worth to the formal historian.

Besides oral tradition, Simms had access to a large mass of miscellaneous manuscripts—letters, journals, unpublished memoirs, and the like<sup>4</sup>—material more suitable for fictional treatment than for orthodox history as Simms knew it. Indeed, the irregular and unofficial nature of most of the guerilla fighting in the state made dependable official records almost nonexistent; and lacking such a framework of hard fact, the formal historian would have to use casual manuscript material with extreme caution.

In his biography of General Marion, Simms frequently complained about the difficulty of ascertaining historical facts.

We have, already, in the opening of this biography, adverted to the melancholy baldness upon which the historian is compelled to rely for the materials of his narrative. Thus, while Marion is everywhere regarded as the peculiar representative in the southern States, of the genius of partisan warfare, we are surprised . . . to find the details so meagre and so unsatisfactory. Tradition mumbles over his broken memories which we vainly try to pluck from his lips and bind together in coherent and satisfactory records . . . We are in possession of but few of the numerous enterprises in which he was engaged. Imperfect memories of the aged give us glimpses of deeds for the

<sup>1</sup>*The Literary World*, X, (January 3, 1852) 3. See also Simms, "Ellet's Women of the Revolution," *Southern Quarterly Review*, I, (July, 1850) 318; also, *The Wigwam and the Cabin* (Redfield Edition), p. 2.

<sup>2</sup>*The Partisan* (Redfield Edition), p. vi.

<sup>3</sup>William P. Trent, *William Gilmore Simms* (New York, 1892), *American Men of Letters Series*, p. 106.

<sup>4</sup>Trent said that Simms had read General Marion's own letters (*op. cit.*, p. 106) and that he had corresponded with various local antiquarians (*Ibid.*, p. 191). In the dedication to *The Forayers* (1855) Simms tells General Jamison, "You will find in the tale that follows that I have borrowed freely from your notes." In a review of Gibbes' *Documentary History of the American Revolution in the Southern Quarterly Review*, IX, (January, 1854) 231 and IX, (April, 1854) 546-547, Simms mentions having had access to a collection of letters and manuscripts that had been in the possession of Peter Horry. Simms himself published a volume of letters by a South Carolina Revolutionary officer, *Memoir and Correspondence of Colonel John Laurens, Bradford Club Series*, No. 7 (New York, 1867) and edited a memoir of a Revolutionary veteran in *Russell's Magazine*, VI, (October, 1859) 59 ff. The extensive manuscript bibliography that Simms included in his account of the siege of Charleston in *South Carolina in the Revolutionary War* (Charleston, 1853) also indicates the amount of manuscript material, particularly journals, available to him. Further, Trent asserted that Simms had collected "every letter and paper he could find that bore upon the Revolution (*op. cit.*, p. 302)."



particulars of which we turn in vain to the dusty pages of the chronicler.<sup>5</sup>

Yet material of little worth in establishing facts might be rich in suggestions for fiction. Indeed, Simms asserted that the letters and other manuscripts which had belonged to Peter Horry, an officer under Marion, had proved useless in the preparation of the biography of Marion but very useful in his fiction—he hoped that they would be more so in the future.<sup>6</sup> Clearly, then, the nature of his material inclined Simms towards fiction rather than history.

A third and most important reason for Simms' choice lay in his dissatisfaction with formal history as he knew it and in his high regard for the historical romance as a medium for recreating the past. While it is possible that his contrasting of the two genres to the disadvantage of history was in part a rationalization of his own necessities, the status of historical writing during his lifetime made his preference much more valid than it would be today.

Simms found two serious deficiencies in the histories of his day. Most histories, he thought, show only great men as living; the people, on the contrary, are revealed as only a dead mass. But, Simms believed, the history of a republic like the United States should be the story of a race rather than that of important individuals.<sup>7</sup>

The writer of historical romances, Simms thought, can correct this deficiency by choosing his characters to represent the general population rather than to enshrine only those who won fame. The desire to tell that part of a people's war which the histories had left untold was with Simms a dominating motive in writing his Revolutionary Romances. He asserted this purpose in the "Introduction" to the revised edition of *The Partisan*:

A sober desire for history — the unwritten, the unconsidered, but veracious history — has been with me, in this labor, a sort of principle . . . to embody and model those features of the Past, which the sober History has left indistinct, as not within her notice, or unworthy her regard. History, indeed, as we style it somewhat complacently, is quite too apt to overlook the best essentials of society — such as constitute the moving impulses of men to action — in order to dilate on great events, — scenes in which men are nearly [merely?] massed,

<sup>5</sup>Simms, *The Life of Francis Marion* (New York, 1845), 331 ff.

<sup>6</sup>*Southern Quarterly Review*, IX, (January, 1854) 231. In *Russell's Magazine*, VI, (October, 1859) 59 ff., Simms edited a memoir of a Revolutionary veteran, remarking that such memoirs were the "sort of material out of which the inventions of art in fiction are apt to be most happily wrought."

<sup>7</sup>"Kennedy's Life of Wirt," *Southern Quarterly Review*, I, (April, 1850) 194-195. For similar objections to histories as Simms knew them, see also "History for the Purpose of Art," *Views and Reviews, First Series* (New York, 1845), pp. 31-32; and "Lucan De Ayllon," *The Wigwam and the Cabin* (Redfield Edition), p. 430 n. History, "speaking vaguely, as is but too much her wont," says nothing in detail of those people "whose deficient stature fails to inform or to influence her sympathies."



while a single favorite overtops all the rest, the Hero rising to the Myth, and absorbing within himself all the consideration which a more veracious and philosophical mode of writing would distribute over states and communities, and the humblest walks of life.<sup>8</sup>

A second objection that Simms made to history was that it is likely to be dull and lifeless. He objected particularly to the matter-of-fact histories of such men as Niebuhr.

We are to believe in the dry-bones, since our eyes have present proof of their existence . . . we shall even be suffered to conjecture that these dry-bones were once covered with flesh, and were informed by sense and feeling. But we may go no further. When we would demand more, and assert more, we are met by a question as keenly decapitative in historical criticism, as any which debars disquieting debate in the halls of our legislation:—"Where are your authorities?"<sup>9</sup>

The historical romance, however, Simms believed, adds life and color to the dead facts.

It is the province of romance, even more decidedly than history, to recall the deeds and adventures of the past. It is to fiction that we must chiefly look for those living and breathing creations which history quite too unfrequently [*sic*] deigns to summon to her service. The warm atmosphere of present emotions, and present purposes, belongs to the *dramatis personae* of art; and she is never so well satisfied in showing us human performances, as when she betrays the passions and affections by which they were dictated and endured. It is in spells and possessions of this character, that she so commonly supersedes the sterner muse whose province she so frequently invades; and her offices are not the less legitimate, as regards the truthfulness of things in general, than are those of history, because she supplies those details which the latter, unwisely as we think, but too commonly, holds beneath her regard . . . We shall employ, without violating, the material resources of the Historian, while seeking to endow them with a vitality which fiction only can confer.<sup>10</sup>

Thus, for reasons that to him seemed good, Simms elected to tell the story of partisan warfare in South Carolina in fiction, not in orthodox history. In spite of the form he chose, however, one should not forget that his dominant purpose was, as he explained in the "Introduction" to *The Partisan*, "to give a story of events, rather than of persons." The fact of the matter is that Simms, whether wisely or not, chose to write both history and fiction at the same time.

### III

This double purpose of Simms in writing his Revolutionary Romances has some significance for both the historian and the student of

<sup>8</sup>*The Partisan*, p. vii.

<sup>9</sup>"History for the Purposes of Art," *op. cit.*, pp. 22-23. This essay contains Simms' most elaborate discussion of the relation between history and fiction.

<sup>10</sup>Vasconcelos (Redfield Edition), pp. 1-2. See also "History for the Purposes of Art," *op. cit.*, pp. 23-24.

literature. Even the mature historian may get something of the feel of partisan warfare in South Carolina from Simms, a capable and well-informed observer; and for college students of history these books offer a valuable supplement to a formal study of the period.<sup>11</sup>

Students of literature in evaluating these novels have all too often failed to judge the author's work in the light of what he was trying to do. Simms himself answered critics of his own day who found *The Partisan* insufficiently elevating and elegant for what they thought a historical romance should be:

My friend objects to the preponderance of low and vulgar personages in my narrative. The question first occurs, "Does the story profess to belong to a country and to a period of history which are alike known — and does it misrepresent either?" If it does not, the objection will not lie. In all other respects it is the objection of a romanticist — of one who is willing to behold in the progress of society none but its most lofty and elevated attributes — who will not look at the materials which make the million, but who picks out from their number the man who should rule, not the men who should represent . . . I certainly feel that, in bringing the vulgar and the vicious mind into exceeding activity in a story of the borders, I have done mankind no injustice . . . I am persuaded that vulgarity and crime must always preponderate — dreadfully preponderate — in the great majority during a period of war . . ."<sup>12</sup>

Simms' biographer and most influential critic, W. P. Trent, whose study of Simms was published in 1892, does the novelist the same injustice. In the midst of testifying to the excited interest with which the reader follows the story in *Eutaw*, Trent pauses to remark, "Of course if our blood is cool, we are apt . . . to wonder why Simms would fancy he was writing romance when he was really writing history."<sup>13</sup>

Indeed, Trent had a narrow, hard-and-fast concept of what a romance ought to be, a concept greatly at variance with Simms' realistic purpose and practice in writing the Revolutionary Romances. In fact, Trent asserted that "the chief conditions of the existence of any romance" is "that it should pacify and elevate the minds and hearts of its readers."<sup>14</sup> Simms, however, was not trying to "pacify and elevate the minds and

<sup>11</sup>The five best novels, in the chronology of events, are *The Partisan*, *Katharine Walton*, *The Forayers*, *Eutaw*, and *Woodcraft*. Unfortunately there are no modern editions of any of these books.

<sup>12</sup>Mellichampe (Redfield Edition), pp. 5-6.

<sup>13</sup>Trent, *op. cit.*, p. 214. See also p. 106. "That Simms did not pray enough for the true and the beautiful while writing *The Partisan* is evident from the bald passages in which he forgets that he is a romancer and fancies himself an historian of the Revolution in Carolina." See, too, p. 192, where Trent complains that *Katharine Walton* "reads, in fact, too much like a carefully prepared social history."

<sup>14</sup>Trent, *op. cit.*, p. 209. Trent also asserted (p. 328) "If the friends of romance are to make any firm stand against the attacks of the realists, they must make it right here, on the essentially ennobling qualities of great romances."



hearts" of his readers; he was trying to give an accurate and representative picture of unusually blood-thirsty strife. Much criticism of Simms since 1892, particularly in textbooks on American literature, has been but an echo of Trent. Students of American literature would do well to reinterpret Simms' Revolutionary Romances in the light of his historical purpose.



UNITED STATES AGGRANDIZEMENT, 1850-1860  
—THE WALKER EXPEDITIONS AS AN  
ILLUSTRATIVE CASE

WILLIAM H. PATTERSON

I—INTRODUCTION

The various stimuli which converted the City of Rome into the Roman Empire, England into the British Empire, and a strip of colonies along the Atlantic coast into that heterogenous collection of states, territories, dependencies, and leases in perpetuity called the United States of America has been one of the enigmas confronting historians.

However the decade 1850-1860 has been to many authors dealing with the period in which it was not necessary to look far for the motivating impulse: it was simply a desire on the part of the South to expand the slave-holding territories and of the North to maintain the balance with additional free-soil areas. This hypothesis would appear to be an oversimplification. The United States was far from satiated with the additions of Texas, Oregon and the Mexican cession in the years just before 1850 and was looking for new territories to regenerate. Perhaps the spirit of the times is expressed by that triumvirate of expansionism in the Ostend Manifesto when they said "the present is an age of adventure, in which restless and daring spirits abound in every portion of the world."<sup>1</sup>

These restless spirits of the United States were the subject of many foreign tirades, being referred to by the London *Examiner*<sup>2</sup> in 1854 as enterprising and go-ahead cousins who were resolved to take Cuba, a great slice of Mexico, a route at Tehuantepec, overthrow the government of the Sandwich Islands as well as having designs in South America. And in the same year an article in the *Dublin University Magazine* describes our methods of conquest by roving bands of squatters who were "the pioneers of civilization and the traillieurs of the all-absorbing republic", adding that when these areas were half-Americanized an open break would result in a new star being added to the growing constellation.<sup>3</sup> English journalists in *The Economist* reached the height of their bitter denunciation in depicting the Democratic Party, declaring that the foreign policy of this group was indefensible since they were the defenders of the Texan annexation, and the planners of the piratical expeditions against Cuba.<sup>4</sup>

Mr. Franklin Pierce in his inaugural address in May 1853, declared that "My administration will not be controlled by any timid forebodings

<sup>1</sup>House Ex. Doc. No. 93, 33rd Cong., 2nd Sess., p. 130. S. 790.

<sup>2</sup>The Living Age, XLII (1854), 563.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 244.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., XXXIV (1852), 474, from the *Economist*.

of evil from expansion". And before this speech was delivered more conservative Democrats had insisted on certain last-minute changes in its phraseology. The most noteworthy of these referred to territorial expansion. Mr. Pierce had written that new possessions "will be sought not with a grasping spirit" which was modified to read should we obtain the new possessions "it will be through no grasping spirit".<sup>5</sup> This expressed policy of the Democrats in 1853 was to temper rather than change the policy of the Whigs. And though there were many in the South crying out for the annexation of Cuba and other areas toward the Equator, believing that the safety of such institutions as slavery lay in this movement, there were others opposed to the annexation for fear of competition from the new areas and because of retaliation from the free-soil areas.

Of all the areas covetously-eyed by the United States during the 1850's, none were to receive the attention that was directed toward Cuba and it becomes a case in point for all the arguments pro and con on expansion. The year 1851 saw the death of Narciso López in Havana after the failure of his third filibustering expedition to that country and there were many abroad who looked upon this as a *quasi* national undertaking. Virtually every one saw it as an attempt by the South to extend its influence and enlarge the slave-holding territories. The London *Times* of September 9, 1851, concurred with this view but expressed the opinion that the administration of Fillmore and Webster had a sincere desire to repress the lawlessness manifested in parts of the South. The *Times* feared the acquisition of Cuba would lead to the North turning to Canada and thus set off a chain reaction which would drive the Europeans from North America and the West Indies.<sup>6</sup>

At the same time much evidence can be presented that opinion in the South was not unanimous for the acquisition of Cuba. A careful perusal of *DeBow's Review* for the ten year period will indicate many articles both for and against the acquisition, the policy of the magazine itself being against it. Sugar planters of Louisiana feared that it would represent a new area of competition. Some felt that it allowed very little room for expansion, as it was a relatively small area, and that it would remain Spanish after all; and others feared that it would merely be a matter of trading Cuba for Canada, the latter, of course, being a much larger area.<sup>7</sup> The New York *Times* expressed the opinion in 1853 that while it was the South which first urged the acquisition of Cuba, a reversal of viewpoints had taken place because of the difference in slave laws in Cuba. These laws limited the power of the master and facilitated emancipation. The newspaper added that the North, too, had undergone a

<sup>5</sup>R. F. Nichols, *Franklin Pierce, Young Hickory of the Granite Hills*, (Philadelphia, 1931), p. 233.

<sup>6</sup>*The Living Age*, XXXI (1851), 190.

<sup>7</sup>*DeBow's Review*, XVII (1854), 49; XIV (1853), 63-66.



change—now favoring annexation because of its increase in investments in that island.<sup>8</sup>

Out of the Cuban question came a document which has been referred to as the "most insolent in the entire history of diplomacy";<sup>9</sup> the Ostend Manifesto, issued in 1854. It declared that self-preservation was the first law of nature, and though the United States had always acquired territory by fair purchase, if Cuba in the possession of Spain endangered the United States we would be justified in wrestling it from that country if we possessed the power.<sup>10</sup>

Secretary of State W. L. Marcy was opposed to the document but did not indicate that he thought his ministers had exceeded their authority. This incident led the London *Times* to observe that diplomacy in America was certainly a singular profession,<sup>11</sup> and to S. F. Bemis it is a naked exhibition of the union of slavery and diplomacy.<sup>12</sup>

Agitation was under way for the annexation of Canada as well. Here the North was anxious and the South implacable in opposition to the addition of any territory northward. The North dallied, following the advice of a Northern newspaper which suggested that "when the fruit is fully ripe it will fall into our lap without any exertion on our part".<sup>13</sup> Sectionalism is seen in the political sparring of the Senator from New Hampshire, who declared in opposition to Senator Cass' resolution for the annexation of Cuba, that "Canada was as important to our northern coast as Cuba to the southern coast".<sup>14</sup> The Reciprocal Trade Treaty with Canada passed by the Democratic Senate in 1854 ended much of this tumult.

Another area fated to receive the attention of the United States was Mexico. One of the first objectives here was a natural boundary which would incidentally serve the interest of a Pacific railway. (Though it would add territory to the slavery cause—this was a minor issue. The real object was imperialism.)<sup>15</sup> With this goal in mind, James Gadsden of South Carolina was sent down to negotiate with Mexico. A treaty was signed on December 30, 1853, which gave to the United States 19,000,000 acres of desert land, free passage for the citizens of the United States through the Colorado River to the Gulf of California and the right of transit for the United States Government and its citizens across the

<sup>8</sup>*The Living Age*, XXXVI (1856), 524.

<sup>9</sup>L. M. Sears, *A History of American Foreign Relations*, (New York, 1927), p. 267.

<sup>10</sup>House Ex. Doc. No. 93, 33rd Cong., 2nd Sess., pp. 130-131.

<sup>11</sup>Quoted by John W. Foster, *Century of American Diplomacy 1776-1876*, (New York, 1901), p. 346.

<sup>12</sup>S. F. Bemis, *A Diplomatic History of the United States*, (New York, 1942), p. 322.

<sup>13</sup>Quoted by L. B. Shippee, *Canadian American Relations, 1849-*, (New Haven, 1939), pp. 19-20.

<sup>14</sup>*Congressional Globe*, 32 Cong., 2nd Sess., p. 226.

<sup>15</sup>L. M. Sears, *op. cit.*, pp. 269-270.



Isthmus of Tehuantepec, and in return Mexico received \$15,000,000 and the cancellation of \$5,000,000 in claims.<sup>16</sup>

In 1858 Senator Houston of Texas introduced a resolution to investigate the advisability of establishing a protectorate over all of Central America and Mexico. And in the presidential message of 1858, President Buchanan proposed the occupation of northern Sonora and Chihuahua for the better protection of the border, and again in 1859, Buchanan recommended intervention to Congress, none of these projects meeting with favor. Another scheme which failed was the McLane-Ocampo Treaty of 1859 by which, in exchange for a loan of \$4,000,000, the United States would get perpetual right of ways across the Isthmus of Tehuantepec and an accompanying convention would have given the United States a general power of police over Mexico.<sup>17</sup>

As in the proposed annexation of Cuba, Southern opinion was divided. It was feared that the annexing of Mexico would present a problem, in as much as slave labor would be adding a new element to that country, and if a free-soil area it would complete a cordon of abolition states that already engirdled the South.

The United States was active in other parts of the New World as well. In the Panama Riots of 1856 the United States saw fit to land troops in that country. *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* of November, 1857, asserted that the object of the United States was to insure herself a monopoly of the transit route, that we had no intention of annexation on a large scale, desiring only enough territory for the purpose.<sup>18</sup>

Further down in Paraguay, following an incident involving a United States vessel, the Government despatched a fleet of fifteen vessels with large calibre guns to demand an apology. *Harper's Weekly* of May 15, 1858, stated that we could hardly be suspected of any unfair designs with regard to Paraguay, that the most ambitious citizens of this republic could only ask the right to trade there on fair and equal terms.<sup>19</sup>

On around Cape Horn in Chile, a writer in 1856 said that already parts of America had fallen into the clutches of the Anglo-Saxon boaconstrictor and that the advance guard of the guerillas were scouring the isthmus, Panama hanging in suspense, and added "We commence to follow the steps of the Colossus, which steadily advances without fear of anyone". These same sentiments were being expressed in Peru and Ecuador. Dr. Dexter Perkins in his discussion of the Monroe Doctrine says that the prestige of the United States was never lower in the republics of the South than in the decade of the fifties.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>16</sup>S. F. Bemis, *op. cit.*, pp. 325-326.

<sup>17</sup>Dexter Perkins, *The Monroe Doctrine 1826-1867*, (Baltimore, 1933), pp. 336-342.

<sup>18</sup>*Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, LXXXII (Nov. 1857), 545.

<sup>19</sup>*Harper's Weekly*, II (May 15, 1858), 306.

<sup>20</sup>Dexter Perkins, *op. cit.*, p. 249.

Nearer home in Santo Domingo, President Pierce in 1853 sent a representative to that country, instructed to offer recognition of the republic in exchange for the cession of Samana Bay, and though the republic was willing to fulfill this requirement, the representatives of Great Britain and France protested so vigorously, that the idea was dropped for the time being.<sup>21</sup>

Across the Pacific, the United States was active in Hawaii, where its minister negotiated in 1854 an abortive treaty for the annexation of these islands, but because of British advice to the Hawaiians to insist on a clause giving them statehood, the treaty was never presented to the Senate.<sup>22</sup>

Commodore Perry was despatched in November, 1852, to Japan with an adequate force to compel an audience, securing a commercial treaty in 1854, an act which was later referred to by Secretary Seward as the time "we gently coerced Japan into friendship with us".<sup>23</sup> In spite of the size of Perry's fleet, an American writer points out that the treaty was not imposed by might, the orders to Perry reading that force should only be used in self-defense.<sup>24</sup> A Japanese author searching for the attitude of public opinion quotes an American newspaper which declared "There is no money in the treasury for the conquest of the Japanese Empire, and the administration will hardly be disposed to pursue such a romantic notion".<sup>25</sup>

## II—THE EXPEDITIONS OF WILLIAM WALKER

(This is a condensation of a seminar, *The Expeditions and Times of William Walker* by W. H. Patterson, at the University of South Carolina.)

Symptomatic of the aggressiveness of this era was the "grey-eyed man of destiny", William Walker. He was born in Nashville, Tennessee, May 8, 1824, the son of a Scottish banker. He received the M. D. degree from the University of Pennsylvania but soon changed to law and moved to New Orleans. Still searching for a career, he turned to journalism in that city and went to California in 1849.

Walker was a conservative in the early part of his career, perhaps even an abolitionist; while he was editor of the New Orleans *Crescent* its tone was so conservative as to be referred to in South Carolina and Mississippi as a "Yankee" paper and its editorials ridiculed the filibustering designs then directed against Cuba. After moving to California while writing for the Sacramento *Daily Democratic Journal* Walker said, in part,

<sup>21</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 268-272.

<sup>22</sup>S. F. Bemis, *op. cit.*, p. 323.

<sup>23</sup>Quoted by John W. Foster, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

<sup>24</sup>Payson J. Trent, *Japan and the United States, 1853-1921*, (Stanford University, Calif., 1928), p. 28.

<sup>25</sup>Inazo Nitobe, *The Japanese Nation*, (New York, 1912), p. 280.



The true friends of the South are those who repudiate the ideas and acts of the South Carolina school and who believe the truly policy of the slave states is conservative rather than aggressive.

However, circumstances were to draw Walker closer to the extreme position of the South, and his views in 1854 were radically different from those of 1858 when in desperate need of recruits he turned to the South for help, declaring that its true field for exertion was in Tropical America.<sup>1</sup>

Walker was motivated by a desire for personal glory. He planned to extend his temporal power over Central America and Mexico, disavowing any desire to annex Nicaragua to the Federal Union.<sup>2</sup> In examining him he appears to be more of an opportunist than a man of real convictions. And though he eventually turned to the South for support, it is interesting to note that the ships and money for his only really successful campaign were furnished by a group of New York capitalists and not by those interested in slave or territorial expansion *per se*.

General Walker led five expeditions during the period between 1854 and 1860. The first of these was against Mexico in late 1853 and early 1854. In the early fifties the Mexican government had undertaken the settlement of the more sparsely inhabited areas of Sonora with foreigners, and to stop the advance of the Anglo-Americans this settlement was restricted to Europeans. However, Walker became interested in the idea, and it is said that the demonstration under López against Cuba, receiving as it did a general tone of approval from the press and public opinion, offered flattering inducements for the forwarding of a plan of conquest.<sup>3</sup> In Dr. Willian O. Scroggs' authoritative study he maintains that the Sonoran enterprise was not the result of any concerted movement of Southern men for the expansion of slavery.<sup>4</sup>

The expedition landed November 3, 1853, at La Paz in Lower California, and soon thereafter Walker declared himself president of a republic composed of both Lower California and Sonora.

Shortly after this General John E. Wool arrived in San Francisco armed with instructions from the Secretary of War, Jefferson Davis, which said in part that among his duties would be that of maintaining our international obligations "by preventing unlawful expeditions against the terri-

<sup>1</sup>W. O. Scroggs, *Filibusters and Financiers, The Story of William Walker*, (New York, 1916), pp. 13 and 69. (Hereafter referred to as *Filibusters*.)

William Walker, "General Walker's Policy in Central America," *DeBow's Review*, XXVIII (Feb. 1860), 172.

<sup>2</sup>W. O. Scroggs, "William Walker's Designs on Cuba," *Mississippi Valley Review*, I (Sept. 1914), 198-199.

C. W. Doubleday, *Reminiscences of The "Filibuster" War in Nicaragua*, (New York and London, 1886), p. 165.

<sup>3</sup>W. V. Wells, *Walker's Expedition to Nicaragua, etc.*, (New York, 1856), p. 23.

<sup>4</sup>W. O. Scroggs, *Filibusters*, p. 51.



tories of foreign powers" and that he was to co-operate with the civil authorities in maintaining the neutrality laws.<sup>5</sup> Wool was a good soldier and took his instructions literally, arresting the leaders of reinforcements for Walker, and for his pains received a letter of censure from Jefferson Davis stating that he was not to "originate arrests and prosecutions for civil misdemeanors",<sup>6</sup> and at the same time the *Washington Union* criticised Wool for neglecting his duties elsewhere.<sup>7</sup> The net result of this was that henceforth Wool made no attempts to stop filibustering expeditions.

Nevertheless it was to the army Walker surrendered when he and his followers, harassed by Mexican forces and ill-equipped for desert warfare, were forced to surrender just across the border from Tia Juana May 8, 1854.

This filibusteing raid resulted in international complications. For instance, James Gadsden informed the Charleston (S. C.) *Daily Courier* that the peninsula of Lower California would probably have been obtained for the United States "had not the insane expedition caused Santa Anna to set his face resolutely against it".<sup>8</sup>

Although the Neutrality Act of 1818 had serious limitations, it is evident that the government of the United States was unwilling to restrain its citizens. The wretched affair at San Francisco was to be repeated over and over again; the muddling of port officials at Mobile and New Orleans, the Commodore Pauling censure for his capture of Walker, the endorsement of Walker's enterprise in the Democratic platform of 1856, and the publicly expressed opinion of such officials as the Governor of New Jersey and the Hon. Lewis Cass, later to be Secretary of State,<sup>9</sup> all give proof of the *laissez faire* attitude of the Democratic administration in power.

The next theatre of operations for William Walker was to be Nicaragua, a country which had suffered from constant revolution since its independence from Spain in 1821. In 1850 Nicaragua had a population of about 260,000, one-half of which was mixed Spanish-Indian, one-third pure blooded Indian, a tenth white and the remaining twelve per cent negroes. This population was described by one of the members of the filibustering expedition as "the effete and decadent descendants of the early Spanish colonists who must succumb and give place to the superior activity and intelligence of the Anglo-Saxon. The term 'Manifest Destiny' is no longer a Myth".<sup>10</sup>

<sup>5</sup>House Ex. Doc. No. 88, 35th Cong., 1st Sess., p. 6. S. 956.

<sup>6</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 5.

<sup>7</sup>Quoted by J. F. Rippey, *United States and Mexico*, (New York, 1926), p. 172.

<sup>8</sup>P. N. Garber, *The Gadsden Purchase*, (Philadelphia, 1924), pp. 97-98.

<sup>9</sup>R. W. Van Alstyne, "American Filibusters and the British Navy, A Caribbean Analogue of Mediterranean Policy," *American Journal of International Law*, XXXII (Jan. 1938), 138-139.

W. V. Wells, *op. cit.*, p. 229.

<sup>10</sup>W. V. Wells, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

The unstable situation in Nicaragua made the entrance of filibusters a simple matter. A contract was made with the so-called Democratic Party, one of the contending factions, whereby Walker was to receive a grant of 52,000 acres of land and his men were designated as colonists. This was modified on his arrival in Nicaragua to authorize the recruiting of 300 men for military service. Walker sailed from San Francisco May 4, 1855, and arrived on June 16.

The man who was to back Walker's enterprise was not a Southern slave-owner but Cornelius Vanderbilt, who had in 1850 secured a charter from the Republic of Nicaragua to construct an isthmian canal, an idea which was later modified to a scheme whereby passengers from the Atlantic seaboard would be transported to the Pacific through Nicaragua. Naturally the officials of this company, the Accessory Transit Company, would be interested in a stable government in Nicaragua, and they held the key to the success or failure of the expedition, as the company furnished easy and rapid transportation to the United States.

Walker in his own book, *War in Nicaragua*, which was published in 1860, describes, in considerable detail, his campaigns to achieve success in Nicaragua.<sup>11</sup> One characteristic incident was the use of an Accessory Transit steamer to transport his troops to the city of Granada, the capital, captured October 13, 1855. It has been claimed that the steamer was used by prearrangement with the two Vanderbilt partners, G. K. Garrison and Charles Morgan who were attempting to gain control of the company,<sup>12</sup> but Walker refutes the assertion.<sup>13</sup>

Walker's success resulted in the signing of a treaty of peace on October 23 between the two warring factions. Under its terms Walker became the commander-in-chief of the army. At the same time the Accessory Transit Company advanced Walker \$20,000. The company was further involved by securing and transporting recruits for use by the Nicaraguan army.

Four months after the signing of the treaty of peace Walker committed the greatest blunder of his career. He revoked the charter of the Accessory Transit Company, seized its property and the following day handed it over to Garrison and Morgan. In this act he had, according to Dr. Scroggs, "not only killed the goose that laid the golden egg, but he had done even worse by creating a powerful enemy in the person of the owner of the fowl".<sup>14</sup>

Shortly after the capture of Granada the United States minister to Nicaragua recognized the new government, but in this step he was not

<sup>11</sup>William Walker, *War in Nicaragua*, (Mobile, Ala., 1860). For the Central American viewpoint see Lorenzo Montufar, *Walker en Centro-America*, (Guatemala, 1887). Walker's account of his military actions is used by Montufar.

<sup>12</sup>Wayne Andrews, *The Vanderbilt Legend*, (New York, 1941), p. 54.

<sup>13</sup>W. Walker, *War in Nicaragua*, p. 110.

<sup>14</sup>W. O. Scroggs, "Walker's Designs on Cuba," p. 201.



upheld by his superiors in Washington. Later, in June 1856, a *coup d'etat* split the new government, and Walker set up his own regime and by an election was declared president of Nicaragua. Instructions had been sent to the United States minister to establish relations with the government of Nicaragua before the upheaval and he took advantage of these instructions to recognize the Walker government.<sup>15</sup>

Walker's resourceful enemy, Cornelius Vanderbilt, had not been idle. The governments of Honduras, Guatemala and Salvador entered into a treaty of alliance and promised aid to the government in Nicaragua which opposed Walker. It is said that Vanderbilt was instrumental in the formation of this alliance.<sup>16</sup> And in the latter part of 1856 Vanderbilt sent Sylvanus H. Spencer, the son of a former United States Secretary of War, and R. C. Webster and Colonel Cauty of the British army to act with the allies. These men quickly outwitted Walker and his officers, closed the transit route and penned Walker up in the town of Rivas where he finally surrendered to Captain Davis of the USS *St. Mary's* in May 1857. His defeat has been attributed largely to the efforts of Vanderbilt and the interference of the British and United States governments.<sup>17</sup>

There were 2518 men who took part in the various campaigns under Walker, and of this number 1000 either died in action or from disease, and they were opposed by an estimated 17,800 troops of which 5860 were killed or wounded in action.<sup>18</sup> The men who made up the American army were from all walks of life, described by one of their officers as the class found around the wharves of the Southern cities with here and there a Northern bank cashier who had suddenly changed his vocation.<sup>19</sup> A brother of a governor of South Carolina, George D. Tillman, was among those present,<sup>20</sup> and there were evidently other South Carolinians, since the United States attorney at Charleston stated that one Captain Mackey was arrested and examined at Columbia where Douglas B. DeSaussure testified that there has been a rumor that Captain Mackey was organizing an expedition to cooperate with General Walker, and that he had been offered a commission as first lieutenant but had changed his mind. Captain Mackey was permitted to go out to procure sureties to the bond of \$3000 and naturally did not return.<sup>21</sup>

No sooner had General Walker returned to the United States than he began formulating plans for a second campaign to regain his lost territories. In these plans he was opposed by the representatives of the Cen-

<sup>15</sup>W. Walker, *War in Nicaragua*, p. 232.

<sup>16</sup>Wayne Andrews, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

<sup>17</sup>W. O. Scroggs, "William Walker and the Steamship Corporation in Nicaragua," *American Historical Review*, X (July, 1905), 805-807.

<sup>18</sup>W. O. Scroggs, *Filibusters*, p. 305.

<sup>19</sup>C. W. Doubleday, *op. cit.*, p. 178.

<sup>20</sup>E. B. Simkins, *Pitchfork Ben Tillman*, (Baton Rouge, 1944), p. 33.

<sup>21</sup>House Ex. Doc. No. 24, 35th Cong., 1st Sess., p. 13, S. 950.

tral American republics<sup>22</sup> in Washington whose protests were given lip-service by the government of the United States. However, while out on bail from New Orleans, Walker sailed out to sea from Mobile under the nose of the customs collector of that port. The Secretary of State had issued a circular enjoining vigilance on the part of United States authorities, and a copy of this memorandum was sent to Commodore Hiram Paulding, commanding the American squadron at Aspinwall, Panama.<sup>23</sup> Walker's ship, eluding all pursuers, landed at San Juan del Norte. Paulding was notified of his arrival and proceeded to that port and forced Walker to surrender to him on December 8, 1857, thus ending the second expedition.<sup>24</sup>

The arrest of Walker created a domestic upheaval. President Buchanan declared in a special message to Congress that "in capturing General Walker and his command after they had landed on the soil of Nicaragua, Commodore Paulding, has, in my opinion, committed a grave error". He added that Paulding would have been within his rights to have intercepted the steamer on the high seas, and then ended his speech by declaring that it was the destiny of the American race to spread over the continent of North America.<sup>25</sup> No charges were filed against Walker on his return to this country. Public opinion in the South seems to have been on the side of Walker.<sup>26</sup> The Central American republics were appreciative of the work of Commodore Paulding and so notified Washington.<sup>27</sup> The commodore was removed from his command and advised by the Navy Department that the "views entertained by the President were the views entertained by this department".<sup>28</sup>

After this failure Walker turned more and more toward the South for support, pointing out the advantages of Nicaragua for the institution of slavery.<sup>29</sup>

Not daunted by his early experiences Walker again sailed from Mobile on December 3, 1858, on the schooner *Susan*, and though it was his intention to finance this expedition by the seizure of church plate and other valuables belonging to those who opposed him in Nicaragua, these treasures were to be safe from his vandalism since on December 16 the

<sup>22</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 4-10.

<sup>23</sup>House Ex. Doc. No. 74, 35th Cong., 1st Sess., p. 1, S. 964.

<sup>24</sup>House Ex. Doc. No. 24, 35th Cong., 1st Sess., p. 65.

<sup>25</sup>Senate Doc. No. 13, 35th Cong., 1st Sess., p. 1, S. 918.

<sup>26</sup>See the Charleston (SC) *Mercury* of Jan. 9, 1858, p. 3 and the Columbia (SC) *South Carolinian*, Dec. 27, 1857, p. 3 for reports from Virginia, New Orleans, and Mobile.

<sup>27</sup>House Ex. Doc. No. 26, 35th Cong., 1st Sess., p. 1, S. 950.

Columbia (SC) *South Carolinian*, Jan. 16, 1858, p. 2.

Senate Ex. Doc. No. 10, 35th Cong., 1st Sess., pp. 2-5, S. 981.

<sup>28</sup>Senate Doc. No. 63, 35th Cong., 1st Sess., p. 10, S. 930.

<sup>29</sup>For this appeal see William Walker, "Policy in Central America," *DeBow's Review*, XXVIII (February 1860), 159-162.



*Susan* struck a reef. Rescue by a British warship returned the filibusters to Mobile, the expedition having lasted less than a month.<sup>30</sup>

The next plan of Walker's centered around the Bay Islands off the coast of Honduras. The sovereignty of the islands had been the subject of a dispute between the United States and Great Britain for over two decades. The British had little doubt that the islands would be overrun by filibusters once they relaxed their control. Nevertheless on November 28, 1859, a treaty was signed by the British representative with Honduras providing for the restoration of these islands.<sup>31</sup> A large part of the inhabitants, being British subjects were opposed to the transfer and wrote Walker of the possibilities there in supporting them in resisting the Hondurans.<sup>32</sup>

The President of Honduras requested a delay in the transfer of the islands when word of the coming of Walker leaked out and the British flag was left flying, forcing Walker to attack the mainland. He captured Trujillo on August 6, 1860, but made the mistake of dismissing his ship before counting the strength of his foe. Forced to evacuate the town by a British warship and unable to fight the Hondurans in the swamps, Walker surrendered to Captain Norvell Salmon of the HMS *Icarus*. Walker believed that he was to become a state prisoner subject to the jurisdiction of the British courts, but Captain Salmon delivered him to the Honduran military authorities who, amid the cheers of the native spectators, immediately shot him.<sup>33</sup> Dr. Scroggs considers the actions of Captain Salmon treacherous,<sup>34</sup> but *Harper's Weekly* carries the story that Salmon offered Walker the opportunity to beg aid as an American citizen or of British protection which he refused, declaring that he was a citizen of Nicaragua.<sup>35</sup>

In spite of Walker's attempts to appeal to the South, his efforts never attained much success beyond the Gulf cities. A careful check of the South Carolina newspapers of this period fail to reveal any editorial expression of regret, though the accounts of his death were carried in all the papers.

There are many historians who believe that Walker's success would have inured to the benefit of civilization,<sup>36</sup> but all agree that his failure was injurious to private capital in the United States and destroyed

<sup>30</sup>W. O. Scroggs, *Filibusters*, pp. 375-376.

C. Doubleday, *op. cit.*, p. 203.

<sup>31</sup>Scroggs, *Filibusters*, pp. 381-382.

<sup>32</sup>Callender I. Fayssoux *Collection of William Walker Papers*, (Dept. of Middle American Research, New Orleans, 1937), p. 4.

<sup>33</sup>C. Doubleday, *op. cit.*, pp. 216-218.

<sup>34</sup>Scroggs, *Filibusters*, p. 392.

<sup>35</sup>*Harper's Weekly*, Oct. 13, 1860.

<sup>36</sup>Scroggs, *Filibusters*, p. 397.

American influence in Central America, as well as resulting in an enormous destruction of life and property in Nicaragua.<sup>37</sup> It is, perhaps, ironical that the regeneration of Nicaragua was indefinitely deferred as the war resulted in the closing of the isthmus and the turning to Panama. *Harper's Weekly* was well-pleased with his death, and the President of the United States all but congratulated the people on his passing.

A colorful career was ended, and in his death Walker left behind many admirers. A despatch from the New Orleans *Delta* of November 9, 1860, gives evidence of this feeling in declaring:

It may be that, as time develops the history of nations, a proud mausoleum in the capital of regenerated Nicaragua, will mark the dust of her first Anglo-American President.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>37</sup>D. Perkins, *op. cit.*, p. 245.

<sup>38</sup>Charleston (SC) *Mercury*, Nov. 14, 1860, p. 2.



## XENOPHOBIA IN THE SOUTH

G. A. BUCHANAN, JR.

I have been hard put to it to find a subject, at once appropriate and safe, for this occasion.

Customarily, it isn't too difficult. Editors, as jacks of all trades and masters of none, simply choose a subject, any subject, not in the field of their audience—talking to economists about history, to librarians about literature, to newspapermen about nuclear physics, to university students about education, to politicians about economics. And generally, it is a sound policy; sometimes you succeed in teaching some of them something.

Apparently your president is not unacquainted with this formula. When I was asked to make this talk and, in a moment of weakness, consented, I accepted the advice of your program chairman and consulted your president, even though I knew he was busy trying to keep up with American diplomatic history just then when the so-called Truman doctrine was in the making. He advised me to talk on some economic question and I might have done so, if there were any point in talking of economics now when everybody knows what ought to be done and nobody does it.

I even considered the heresy of talking to historians about the history of the future, but Arnold J. Toynbee, the omniscient Britisher, seems to have usurped this field, taking over from Spengler and carrying on to a not much more comfortable conclusion. So I leave it to him. The future is depressing enough to make most of us rejoice that we will not be here to see it. Maybe none will be left to write its history—but that is another speech. And somewhat aside, I am afraid I haven't too much faith in these grandiloquent attempts, noble in motive, to pour all of history into preformed molds. Lord Tweedsmuir, whose name as a simple historian was John Buchan (a truncated form of Buchanan, you will observe) notes somewhere that the wise historian is he who concedes the "eternal presence of the irrational and inexplicable" in history, who finds history full of momentous trifles which have disproportionate results in disturbing and muddying the waters of destiny. How does Edmund Burke put it? "A common soldier, a child, a girl at the door of an inn have changed the face of fortune, and almost of Nature." And H. A. L. Fisher, who died in 1940 when the Second World War was still an European war, had something to say of the same purport. "Men wiser and more learned than I have discovered in history a plot, a rhythm, a predetermined pattern," he said. "These harmonies are concealed from me. I can see only one emergency following upon another as wave follows upon wave, only one great fact with respect to which, since it is unique, there can be no generalizations, only one safe rule for the historian: that he should recognize in the development of human destinies the play of the contingent

and the unforeseen." All of which seems to be a pretty apt description of the world today in which the gift of prescience seems to be running out and drying up.

So I am reduced to more or less simple reporting, to plain and unadulterated journalism, which, as Bernard Shaw says, is also literature, as indeed it may be when Shaw indulges in it. And this, of course, is the greater heresy—the heresy of the shoemaker who sticks to his last.

Journalism is fairly safe. I remember from my college days the opening lecture in the class on anthropology, a lecture delivered by Dr. G. Croft Williams for the benefit and enlightenment of the fairly large group of Columbia Theological Seminary students who invariably found their way into his class. Anthropology, Dr. Williams explained, was the perfect subject. It began after evolution and stopped before history. For the remainder of the term his theological students would answer the inquiries of their professors at the seminary, always on the hunt for heresy at the university, with the statement that anthropology had nothing to do with evolution; it began after evolution. I cannot accuse these gentlemen, now every one of them an esteemed Presbyterian divine, of making an erroneous statement. So I simply assume that they did not know what they were being taught.

Any errors I make, therefore, are excusable as journalism, which isn't history even when it turns up later disguised as history in a footnote. The perspective of journalism is too close; the range of its artillery too short. The things I am concerned about may take care of themselves, set in their proper perspective, or they may be lost in the general deluge, which some bearded Noah may now be preaching, for all I know.

But enough of apology and explanation. I have elected to discuss with you a current manifestation of our Southern civilization—the Southern resistance to outside ideas, the Southern chain reaction to outside criticism, violent and self-destructive.

Now xenophobia, the fear of strangers, is not necessarily an evil thing. Exercised in moderation and practiced with malice aforethought, it can be an antidote to xenomania, the extravagant fondness for foreign things which has made both persons and countries look ridiculous, or xenophilism, the love of foreigners, or that occasional failing of our wives, xenodochialism, the capacity for receiving strangers, sometimes described as Southern hospitality. A little xenophobia may even, like Thomas Jefferson's occasional revolutions, be a good thing—a safeguard against outside tyrannies and against untried and occasionally dangerous experiments.

If this were all that xenophobia in the South amounted to we could dismiss it and forget it. But we in the South carry our xenophobia to inordinate lengths, far beyond simple parochialism or provincialism, almost to psychosis. We react to outside criticism with a violence that may be traditionally Southern, but is also suicidal, punishing ourselves by electing



Bilbos and Talmadges, Rankins and Johnstons to high office in order to get even with Walter Winchell or Drew Pearson, to disconcert the Saturday Evening Post or the New Republic, to confound the C. I. O. or the P. A. C. Georgians, who profess to abhor all that Eugene Talmadge and his ilk stand for, vote for Talmadge because they cannot stomach any expression of a similar abhorrence by voices, outside of Georgia and north of the Mason and Dixon line. Mississippi voters, capable of recognizing the crude and shallow demagoguery of Bilbo for what it is, vote for him not because they prefer such men in office, but simply because it affords them the only way of expressing their resentment of alien criticism. The Southern voter is prepared to spite himself, if he can also spite at least one outsider at the same time.

Nor is this Southern xenophobia any new development. It is "fixt of old and founded strong," dating back probably to the origin of sectionalism in the American colonies and is certainly as old as the first threat to Southern political domination of the early American Republic. Historically speaking, the South has some good reasons to cherish a grudge even now. Defeat in the Confederate War and the resultant excesses of the Reconstruction period, followed by a long era in which the South has been maintained as a colonial economy, subject to exploitation and ridicule, have given the South an inferiority complex, which probably has aggravated the disease, and at the same time has confirmed the South in it.

Today's manifestations of Southern xenophobia, threatening to move beyond politics into other spheres of activity, closely parallel what still must be the most important demonstration of its operation in the shift of sentiment in the South under the impact of Northern abolitionist criticism in the years immediately preceding the Confederate War.

The most fateful voyage to American shores, after the era of discoveries and the first settlements, was made by an unknown ship, which appeared out of the mists of time and tide off Jamestown in the year 1619. Whence the ship came, who was her master, what her name or eventual destination, we do not know. All that we know of her is that she flew the Dutch flag and that there were landed from her twenty Negroes—the first Negroes ever to set foot on the soil of English-speaking America.

Except for this voyage and the later voyages, more profitable to New Englanders, of the "triangular trade" in rum, sugar and slaves and the development in the South of the tobacco, rice and cotton culture, the history of the United States, and particularly the Southern states, would be an entirely different subject from that we teach in our high schools and colleges.

If this nameless ship and its Dutch flag had been lost in a Caribbean hurricane and all aboard had gone down with it before it reached Jamestown in Virginia and the first slave had not been landed here, the South might have been saved the mistake of trying to build a civilization on

slavery and both North and South would have been saved a lot of useless oratory and maybe even the 549,543 lives lost on account of secession. Southern politics today would be something normal and fairly uncomplicated and the Southern economy would be based, as it should be, on the idea of prosperity for the whole people. We would not be taxing ourselves, when we have so little to tax, in order to support two school systems. We might even have fewer religious denominations and certainly we should have much less heat in our discussions of them. Probably we would still have our demagogues, but at least they would not revolve like so many whirling dervishes around the racial issue.

But all of this, of course, is might-have-been, a futile exercise, "flat, stale and unprofitable". The mistake was made in 1619 at Jamestown, but it was soon repeated up and down the Atlantic coast. And nineteen years after this first slave ship reached Virginia and eighteen years after the Mayflower dropped anchor in Massachusetts Bay, the first American slaveship is mentioned by name—the "Desire", built at Marblehead and owned in Salem, a fact of some importance recorded in Winthrop's Journal for February 26, 1638.

Slavery did not, as we know, flourish in New England, which had neither the climate nor the crops for it. But it was not due to any excess of morals on the part of New England or to any prescience on the part of the New Englanders of the role they were later to play in the abolition of slavery. John Adams, who isn't a prejudiced authority, may be cited. "Argument might have had some weight in the abolition of slavery in Massachusetts," he wrote, "but the real cause was the multiplication of labouring white people who would no longer suffer the risk to employ these sable rivals so much to their injury. This principle has kept Negro slavery out of France, England and other parts of Europe." And under the system of gradual emancipation, slavery lingered on in some of the Northern states until well into the Nineteenth century.

The South's agricultural economy and the Southern climate blinded the South to the mistake it was making, and the rice, cotton, indigo and tobacco fields supplies the further excess for letting the Negro do it—if man has ever needed an excuse for getting out of hard work. And then there was the New England slave trader, swapping his rum for slaves and the slaves for sugar to make more rum to get more slaves to exchange for sugar to make more rum, not to mention a fair profit on every phase of the transaction.

But Southerners came early to the realization that slavery, though it had its advantages to the South, was not the "positive good" that Calhoun later described it. As early as 1736, Colonel William Byrd, receiver-general of Virginia, was lamenting the fact that so much rum and so many Negroes were being brought into Virginia by Yankee dealers, "I am sensible," he wrote, "of many bad consequences of multiplying these



Ethiopians amongst us." During the Revolutionary period many of the Southern leaders expressed their regrets that slavery existed on American soil. There was Thomas Jefferson, who applied the natural rights philosophy to slavery with his indictment against the King of England for encouraging the slave trade. George Washington wrote to John F. Mercer of Maryland that it was among his "first wishes to see some plan adopted by which slavery, in this country, may be abolished by law." John Randolph freed all his slaves by his will, after death, and Patrick Henry criticized slavery as being "inconsistent with the Bible, and destructive to Liberty." Even before the American Revolution, some of the colonies, and Virginia in particular, had tried to restrict the slave trade, but such colonial laws were disallowed by the British government, more interested then in the profits to be made than in morals.

Considering the South as a whole, it may be concluded that slavery during this period was on the decline. The institution was not held in high regard in the South at the time of the Revolution, and for the most part the slave-holders considered slavery, from a moral and religious viewpoint, as an evil of which they sincerely desired to be rid. Nor was all the Southern opposition to this "peculiar institution" based on moral and philosophical grounds. The "indefinable dread" of a slave insurrection haunted the minds of the whites and was one of the motives activating the opposition to the slave trade. The slave insurrection in Santo Domingo in 1791 aroused North Carolina to impose a fine of 100 pounds for importing slaves. It required the power of the New England shipping interests to secure the insertion in the Constitution of a clause protecting the slave trade for twenty years.

And the abolition movement in origin was not sectional, although most of the abolitionist strength in the beginning was in the South, where men knew the evils of the slavery system first hand and the handicaps of it. Alice Adams in her "The Neglected Period of Anti-Slavery in America," reports that more than one hundred anti-slavery societies, approximately three-fourths of all in the United States, were in the slave states in 1827.

Because they would be most vitally affected by the race problem that would have resulted—and did—from emancipation, the men of the South were concerned especially with the various schemes for colonization, the idea being to restore the Negroes to their African homes. The American Colonization Society was formed in 1817. At various times it was headed by such men as Monroe, Madison and Marshall, Southerners all. The society was born of a resolution, favoring colonization, passed by the Virginia General Assembly in 1816 and was endorsed by various of the Southern states—Georgia in 1817, Maryland and Tennessee in 1818 before Vermont, first of the Northern states, acted to do likewise in 1819. The four abolition newspapers founded between 1819 and

1828 were all published in the South. It was not only possible to discuss slavery in the South in these years, but the discussion was encouraged in the South's search for the best means of abolishing the evil without endangering its social and economic system.

As late as 1831, despite the spread and the profitableness of the institution—the invention of the spinning frame and the cotton gin had spread cotton culture and slavery throughout the South—the Southern people regarded slavery as an evil to be lamented, not defended. And Northern leaders, such as Dr. William E. Channing, regarded the problem as a national problem. Writing to Daniel Webster in 1828 he pointed out that the North should assure the South that “we consider slavery as your calamity, not your crime and we will share with you the burden of putting an end to it.”

Unless some such attitude were adopted and the offer made to share the “toil and expense” of abolition, he was afraid that matters might be made worse, far worse, “by rousing sectional pride and passion for its support,” a condition which would divide the country and “shake the foundations of government.”

Seek where you will and you must search hard and long before you find a better example of prophecy, later to be fulfilled in bitterness and in bloodshed to its every letter.

For in 1831 occurred two events which were to change the picture and make Dr. Channing's prediction come true. One was the appearance of *The Liberator* on January 1 in which William Lloyd Garrison began his violent attack upon the slaveholders of the South, the tone of which was set by his announcement that he was determined to be “as harsh as truth and as uncompromising as justice” and did not “wish to think, or speak, or write with moderation”. Every issue of *The Liberator*, to add still more emphasis to this incendiary pronouncement, carried in large capitals under the caption, “The American Union,” the challenge, “YOUR COVENANT WITH DEATH SHALL BE ANNULLED AND YOUR AGREEMENT WITH HELL SHALL NOT STAND.”

The other event was the Nat Turner rebellion, which occurred just eight months after Garrison had begun publication of *The Liberator* in Boston. There was probably no connection between the two and there is no evidence that Turner ever heard of Garrison. But the South felt it was living on a volcano, and the news of Turner's rebellion sounded to the slaveholder as the first crack of doom. It was only a quarter of a century since Santo Domingo had demonstrated what a slave rebellion could be. There a few thousand slaves revolted and massacred practically every white man, woman and child remaining on the island, “according to the lowest estimate, 2,500 souls.” And in the South in 1831 were not simply a few thousand slaves, but two and a quarter millions.



Nat Turner, who "cultivated fasting and prayer and the reading of the Bible" when he was not engaged in the Christian, to him, pastime of butchering women and children didn't get very far. Striking when the men of Southampton county were attending a religious meeting in North Carolina, Turner and his followers fell upon the remaining whites, mostly women and children, killing 61 of them before he was captured. It is worth noting that Virginia did not succumb to hysteria and of some forty Negroes participating in the massacre, only 21 were convicted and of these only 13 were executed.

But the Southern reaction was swift, if not sure. By the middle thirties the abolitionist societies had disappeared from the South, except for one left stranded in Kentucky. The radical abolitionists stepped up their attacks, and the South turned from apology for slavery to its defense. Garrison and his fellows replied in kind or better, drawing upon their imaginations to picture the South as given to unspeakable cruelties, inhuman treatment and widespread licentiousness, Southern society was described as corrupted with brutality and violence, and the whole South, Wendell Phillips shouted, is "one great brothel, where half a million women are flogged to prostitution." Garrison called it "one great Sodom." Southern churches and ministers were denounced in unprintable terms, at least by present day Boston standards—a fact which may partly explain the enthusiasm with which Southern clergymen rallied to slavery's defense when both sides took to quoting the Bible to prove their case. And now the South had made the full circuit. Slavery, *per se*, was right and moral, a blessing in the eyes of its defenders, ordained of God.

The temptation is great to go on retelling history to historians, but I have probably already consumed too much time laboring a point that does not need laboring—the point that Southern thinking on slavery was practically reversed in a generation as a result of criticism by the Walter Winchells and the Drew Pearsons of that day. Garrison never did succeed in persuading the North that slavery was worth a war, but he did persuade the South that it was—a fact which the Beards overlook in pointing out that the abolition creed never did rise to the dignity of a first rate political issue in the North. The extremes to which the abolitionists went convinced the South that slavery was only a pretense and that what the North really desired was the total subjugation of the South. "The idea that he was fighting, not to keep the Negro in subjugation, but to keep himself out of it was," Gerald Johnson says, "what nerved the Southern soldier to maintain a hopeless contest through four terrific years."

Out of this controversy came secession and the "irrepressible conflict," which left its deep scars on both the soil and the soul of the South, scars to be rubbed raw in the era of Reconstruction which followed and which have not entirely healed in all the years since. We will not fight

another civil war and, heaven knows, we do not want any more Reconstruction, which was not exactly the blissful estate in South Carolina which Howard Fast depicts in his "Freedom Road."

For some years after the Confederate War we were too busy in the South resisting, in devious ways, military occupation and official venality to be concerned very much with what was said about us outside the South. The defeat itself, however, probably forced us to build up a form of xenophobia in self defense, and the Carpetbagger certainly did nothing to temper our dislike for strangers or for invasion.

The present outbreak of Northern criticism of the South and the consequent violent reaction to it is only a little more vicious and a little more persistent than what we have had to endure for years. The outside critics of the South today have a little better material with which to work, and if they confined their criticisms to the Bilbos and Rankins and their kind and if economic and political motives were not mixed up in it, as they were also mixed up in the anti-slavery dispute, not much harm might be done.

Some years prior to World War I the *Philadelphia North American* sent its Washington correspondent to Alabama to help retire Senator Oscar W. Underwood. Senator Underwood was running for re-election against Representative Richmond Pearson Hobson, an ardent dry, and Mr. Underwood didn't believe in prohibition. The dries of Alabama, led by the Anti-Saloon league, were out to retire him and had picked Hobson, who once had defeated the elder John H. Bankhead in a House race, to accomplish their purpose. Hobson was a good campaigner and until Gus McSween, the Philadelphia newspaper man, got in the row, Underwood was due for a real contest. As it was, with McSween's unintended help, he won handily.

Then during World War I the *New York Herald-Tribune* and other Northern newspapers decided that Representative Claude Kitchin of the Second North Carolina District should be retired. Mr. Kitchin was Democratic leader of the House but sometimes did not see eye-to-eye with President Woodrow Wilson. New York and other Northern reporters swarmed into North Carolina to tell the North Carolinians how to vote themselves out of the House leadership. They reacted by renominating Kitchin by a thumping majority.

Georgia, during the New Deal, reacted in the same way to reelect Senator Walter F. George and South Carolina held its nose and reelected Cotton Ed Smith in reaction to President Franklin D. Roosevelt's purge campaign. In both these cases, however, it is doubtful that resentment of the President's interference played any really significant role in the outcome. Senators George and Smith would probably have been re-elected even if the President had kept his mouth shut, as he should have.



The more recent Bilbo and Talmadge victories in Mississippi and Georgia are a different story. The citizens of Mississippi set out last year to get rid of Bilbo, and a majority of Georgians desired to see the liberal policies of Governor Ellis Arnall continued under James V. Carmichael. And both might have accomplished their aims, except for outside interference, which both Bilbo and Talmadge seized upon to translate into a victory-producing asset.

Walter Winchell and Drew Pearson campaigned against both as they had a right to do, but both sometimes stoop to guttersnipe tactics in their fighting. Their support for the opposition was, therefore, a kiss of death. *The Saturday Evening Post* and *Collier's* sent correspondents into Mississippi and came out with an interesting and accurate denunciation of the Mississippi demagogue and all his works and most of his sayings. The articles were simply so much water on Bilbo's wheel. Other magazines and newspapers did likewise with fairly identical results.

Nor was this all. Just before the Mississippi primary, the National Negro Congress came forth with a resolution demanding that federal troops be sent to Mississippi—an appeal calculated practically to guarantee Bilbo's renomination in a state where memories of federal bayonets are long and vivid. It was a silly suggestion, which was ignored by the federal government, but not by Bilbo. Earlier on May Day the New York Communists made their contribution to Bilbo's reelection by parading with banners, proclaiming "Rankin and Bilbo Must Go!" If either one of these groups had deliberately set about reelecting Bilbo they could not have devised more effective methods of accomplishing that result. Every such Southern demagogue may include in his prayers every night thanks to God for the stupidity of his Northern opponents.

Both Bilbo and Talmadge rang the demagogic changes on the Negro problem and the "white supremacy" issue and so doing aroused the well-meaning persons they intended to excite to denunciation in reply which they then cited as evidence of outside interference. It is as simple as that. Bait the hook and some sucker, even though the water be muddy, will take it.

But even so both had close calls. An actual majority of the voters of Georgia supported Carmichael over Talmadge, and Old Gene, red galluses and all, would have gone down in defeat, except for Georgia's so-called unit system, loaded in favor of the rural voters. Bilbo barely escaped a run-off primary. Talmadge, of course, died before he took office, and Bilbo is now drawing his salary, thanks to a deal with the Republicans, for not acting as United States Senator while the Senate waits for him to present himself and allow the Senators to act on proposals to unseat him.

Elsewhere in the South, and even in Mississippi and Georgia, we elect almost comparable demagogues without benefit of "outside interference." For these errors, which have filled the Congress with such

political hacks as Cole Blease, Cotton Ed Smith, Vardaman, McKellar, Huey Long, Tom Heflin and others like unto them, we must take the responsibility, without even the excuse that the Yankee helped us do it. Blease, of course, was widely attacked in the North for his "To Hell with the Constitution" declaration and for his other inanities, but he never considered the Northern criticism of him worth troubling about, and he did not need, as Bilbo and Talmadge did, to drum up votes by capitalizing on "outside" attacks upon him. The South Carolina attacks were bitter enough to serve his purposes. And the same was true of Pitchfork Ben Tillman, an abler man, by the way, than most of the company we have placed him in. Sadly, I confess it, we can do pretty well for ourselves in the South, without outside aid, and we almost never do as well as we might or should. Part of the trouble is in the single-party, which is to say no-party, tradition in the South. This, coupled with the self-nominating system, under which any man may project himself in any race whether he be entitled to a single voter's consideration—and this prevails in most of the South—has resulted in the disintegration of politics in the South until in many places today it is as low as Tammany's and in a few places hardly above Chicago's or Boston's. \*

And parenthetically, it should be noted here that the South has no monopoly on demagoguery or political ineptitude. Vito Marcantonio and Clayton Powell of New York, Frank Hague of New Jersey and Jim Curley of Boston are proof that ignorance and poverty or folly can produce elsewhere political jackasses as vicious and mischievous as any which have come out of the South.

There are sane and literate Southerners who see the South today as a victim of a Northern literary and journalistic conspiracy. And there is even some evidence to support the theory. Publishers show a predilection for Southern novels emphasizing the degeneracies and the ignorance of the characters of Faulkner and Caldwell, Stripling and their like, or for adventures in miscegenation as is depicted in Lillian Smith's correctly titled, "Strange Fruit." The Northern Negro press and a fair part of the Southern Negro press can see no good at all in the South, or if they see it they never mention it. Winchell and Pearson make a business and some profit out of pillorying the South for its imbecilities and its imbeciles. Criticism of the South, as in the days of the anti-slavery controversy, extends even to the more conservative Northern newspapers, who invariably label a mob killing in the South a lynching, which it usually is, but seldom if ever consider the designation appropriate for a Northern lynching, even when the victim is, as he may be, a Negro. *Time* and *Life* seem to take a particular delight in pricking the South where the skin is raw, and *The New Republic* and *The Nation*, the two remaining "liberal" magazines, evidently consider us fair game, though they never appear to apply the sportsman's code to us, shooting us on the



ground with something of genuine relish. Nor is this especially strange or reprehensible. Every man is somewhat naturally more interested in the mote in the other fellow's eye than the beam in his own. And who could say that we would not be doing the same, if we were in a position to do so?

This could be endured, therefore, if we were a reasonable people, as we are not, and laughed off. But Northern "meddling" goes beyond this. The South's xenophobia has never extended, of course, to migrating industry. Northern industries, and the necessary managerial personnel, we invite into the South, greeting them with tax exemptions and open arms, even when we intend later to soak them for everything they are worth in order that our damage suit lawyers may make a living, assuming, for the sake or argument, that damage suit lawyers are entitled to make a living. And every industry, leaving New England, bound for North Carolina, Georgia, South Carolina or Alabama, is a pound of flesh, cut next the heart of New England. With propaganda, persuasion and some other weapons, not so nice, the industrial east has attempted to resist the irresistible movement, and when all else failed has seen to it that Northern capital controlled, where it could, the South's new industries. The South has been so long a colonial economy that now, the North argues, it should relax and enjoy it. Eastern Governors have fought a bitter-end battle to prevent the equalization of class freight rates, North and South, arguing before the Interstate Commerce Commission that the East is entitled to enjoy, in perpetuity, the advantage it has too long enjoyed, because industries, which might have grown up in the South, settled instead in New England to reap the benefit of the rate advantage. When this strange logic failed them, as it should have, then they resorted to the courts, and the South has not yet received the simple justice that is its due. Northern industry, when the wage and hour law was passed, joined with organized labor to break down the long-existing regional wage differentials, so as to stifle Southern competition. Now wage differentials have practically disappeared, which is all to the good when labor efficiency is equal, and the once demonstrable regional cost-of-living differentials, on which the wage differentials were based, are fast disappearing. The South, however, still offers the richest field for evangelistic work in labor organization, and both the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. are currently conducting large-scale invasions of the South. And in the meanwhile everybody is having a wonderful time, denouncing the South for its slowness and backwardness in labor relations—some even seem to be disappointed that no labor organizers have been lynched in the South or even given the tar-and-feather treatment—and for the stupidity of its industrial Bourbons, matching, they say, the stupidity of their Bourbon henchmen in Congress, ignoring the disconcerting fact that many of the Southern industrialists are Northern industrialists transplanted in the South.

And "Operation Dixie" extends to the political as well as the economic fields; the war against the South is being waged with all types of weapons, and always, of course, with the highest of motives. The attempt to write into Federal law the F. E. P. C., aimed at the South, in particular, is partly economic and partly political in its origin. The perennial effort to write into law a Federal anti-lynching bill and to repeal by Federal act the state constitutional poll taxes are all evidence of and part of this continuing war. And nobody stops to consider whether their enactment will actually impede or promote lynchings, discourage or encourage Negro voting. They too offer opportunities for more criticism of the South and for the resulting xenophobic reaction to it.

Still further complicating matters is the movement stirring among the Negroes of the South for all the rights and privileges they conceive as due them. There is agitation in every state among the Negroes, led by the Southern Negro press, for the ballot and for the elimination of all segregation, beginning with public transportation and the colleges first, but extending eventually to everything and everywhere, a campaign carried on simultaneously and inconsistently with another campaign for the appointment of Negro policemen, Negro firemen, Negro judges and for the establishment of Negro parks and playgrounds, Negro school buses for Negro children.

Not surprisingly, the fears and resentments are getting all mixed up. And the resulting Southern resentment is not all honest. Too much of it is artificially induced and expressed in politically calculated outbursts. Some of it arises from the fears of industrial and agricultural conservatives, worried about their pocketbooks, and some of it stems from pure emotionalism. The resentment of the Southern politician, repudiating these slurs on the fair name of the South, is at once the most despicable of these variously motivated reactions and also the most effective. Senator Bilbo has made himself the mighty defender of the South against these evil forces, the dauntless champion of white supremacy. He has even, *mirabile dictu*, written a book to prove it. And there are others who differ with him only in volume, not in content. The more they are lampooned, the more they gain in the affection of the people. Identifying themselves with the South, they interpret every attack upon them as an attack upon the South. Criticism of them becomes a political asset, a fact which they know, even if their detractors do not.

A little above this is the pennywise resentment, based on economic motives, growing out of the C. I. O.-A. F. of L. invasion. The emotional reaction is more disinterested, but is nonetheless shallow. Transmogrified into an unhealthy suspicion of everything that comes from the North—migrating industries, always excepted—it is at the bottom of the South's opposition to federal aid for education, a proposal from which the South



stands to benefit most, being plentifully supplied with children of school age, but lacking the money to educate them.

The antidote to this "outside" interference is not, as too many Southerners so glibly say, for the North to stop meddling in Southern politics, Southern labor relations and Southern law enforcement. After all, the North has a legitimate interest in the election of a Senator from Mississippi or Georgia, South Carolina or Florida as South Carolina has a legitimate interest in the election of a Senator from Pennsylvania or New York, California or Illinois. After all, every Senator is a Senator of the United States, whether he comes from Alabama or Montana and whether he acts as one or not. The Senators from Ohio vote on matters affecting South Carolina. Our Southern Bilbos and Talmadges are therefore proper concerns of the Northern press and magazines, as the antics of Marcantonio, trying to follow the Communist line, and of Taft, playing the isolationist's game, are proper concerns of the press in the South. Bigotry and racial intolerance are not diseases which can be confined within state boundaries. They can quickly, in a time of mounting minority tensions and growing national hysteria such as the present, become pandemic, and any triumph for them in Mississippi or Georgia encourages them everywhere.

We do, of course, have a right to hope for a little more intelligence and a little more knowledge of Southern ways and reactions from our critics. The North needs to re-examine the techniques of its criticism, giving some consideration, at least, to the end results of what it is doing. I do not ask it, being persuaded that most of the present-day practioners of anti-Southernism are hardened sinners, joined to their idols, for profit, and not easily to be pried loose. All of them are convinced, beyond any appeal to reason, that they are right, and like the abolitionists they do have right on their side—and also the Left. Paraphrasing Wendell Phillips, they say, "God has given me a conscience superior to all fact." Some of them are seers, with an uncanny faith in the legislative process, counted upon to move mountains and to eliminate prejudice overnight. These are, of course, out of the jurisdiction of logic, like too many of their Southern counterparts.

I am concerned that reaction, in the sense of a return to the things that Bilbo and Talmadge advocated, is gaining in the South, making more difficult the solution of the very real and pressing problems which bedevil us. Men with fear and hate in their hearts, no matter how induced, are poor material to supply the clear-minded leadership that the South desperately needs. Clear-minded leadership is a scarce commodity in any democracy at any time and it can be lost entirely in a time of hysteria. How else can you explain the frantic effort of South Carolina's Democratic Party leadership to stay one jump ahead of the Supreme Court of the United States and thereby escape somehow the necessity of obeying

eventually the Constitution of the United States by permitting Negroes the right to vote?

Fundamentally, of course, the Northern critics of the South today are criticising their own heritage. For Southern folkways are essentially American folkways. Racial prejudice is as American as the Declaration of Independence, even when it conflicts with Jefferson's high-flying phrases. Even lynching is in the American tradition and the Greenville lynchers of Willie Earle never approached the gusto with which New Englanders and the Westerners went about the business of exterminating the American Indian. Every new influx of strangers into any community, North or South, East or West, has seen the recrudescence of racial prejudice—directed against the Irish in Boston, the Swedes in the Dakotas, the Japanese in California, the Poles in Pennsylvania and Ohio. It isn't a Southern disease; it is American. Or actually it is universal.

And if both North and South could realize this fact, spokesmen for the one would be less vehement in their criticism and the other less violent in their reactions to it.

Prejudice persists in the South longer than it has in the North. For one reason the racial lines in the North are easily obliterated, except in California, which now vies with the South for race-prejudicial preeminence. A single generation and an Irishman is indistinguishable from a Lowell—at least at a distance. For another the American inheritance of the North has been watered down by the great immigrant flood. The South is more American simply because it is, except for the Negro, more American in its blood than any other section of the country.

And finally the Northern criticism of the South is essentially nothing but urban criticism of an agrarian civilization, the old contest between the city slicker and the hick. They attack us where we are vulnerable, but if it wasn't that they would still attack us. And both of us need to recognize this fact, also.

We have made some progress in the South, even toward granting the Negroes the political rights to which, by law, they are entitled. South Carolina, Alabama and Arkansas are the exceptions that prove the rule and Georgia is unique in wanting to follow South Carolina without being able to do so. Only reason and education and improved economic conditions for both races can solve the racial prejudice problem in the South. And we have made changes here also, improving both the range and calibre of our educational system; the war, by raising the living standards of both whites and Negroes, is credited with an assist in bettering economic conditions. But it is still possible for us to slip back; that is the danger we must guard against.

We need to grow up in the South, to reach that maturity which will permit us to hear ourselves criticised, even maliciously slandered and be



able to ignore the criticism and the slander, going ahead to work out our own destiny for ourselves. No one else will work it out for us; no one else, in the long run, can. It would have been better and wiser, if the South in 1831, forgetting its Yancys and its Rhett, had been able to proceed with its plans and somehow to find a reasonable solution of the problems, posed by emancipation. It would have saved us the war, Reconstruction and eighty years of groping in the dark against unknown odds. And it is better now and wiser for the South to set itself to solve its problems. The South is still sick; it is sick socially, economically and politically, suffering from a disease which is aggravated by pride, by its persecution complex and its traditional defensiveness, by the xenophobic psychosis which holds its mind in thrall.

Most of all we need more money to do more things. The South can conquer its bigotry when its people are better fed, better clothed, better educated, better paid. It can forget prejudice when it has the money to get beyond prejudice, when it has broken the North's strangle-hold upon our economy and eliminated the frictional competition between sub-marginal whites and the Negroes. Higher income can be translated into sociological and political terms.

It is not, of course, a sure process, but it is surer than most of those I know. And it is surer than those the North, engaged in a contradictory effort to keep the South enslaved and complaining that we save our pride by acting like illiterates, has suggested.

It may, however, take too long. Already the waters, in which the South is to be boiled, begin to bubble and are troubled.

## CONSTITUTION

## I

The name of this organization shall be The South Carolina Historical Association.

## II

The objects of the Association shall be to promote historical studies in the State of South Carolina; to bring about a closer relationship among persons living in this State who are interested in history; and to encourage the preservation of historical records.

## III

Any person approved by the executive committee may become a member by paying \$2.00 and after the first year may continue a member by paying an annual fee of \$2.00.

## IV

The officers shall be a president, a vice-president, and a secretary and treasurer who shall be elected by ballot at each regular annual meeting. A list of nominations shall be presented by the executive committee, but nominations from the floor may be made. The officers shall have the duties and perform the functions customarily attached to their respective offices with such others as may from time to time be prescribed.

## V

There shall be an executive committee made up of the officers and of two other members elected by ballot for a term of three years; at the first election, however, one shall be elected for two years. Vacancies shall be filled by election in the same manner at the annual meeting following their occurrence. Until such time they shall be filled by appointment by the president. The duties of the executive committee shall be to fix the date and place of the annual meeting, to attend to the publication of the proceedings of the Association, to prepare a program for the annual meetings, to prepare a list of nominations for the officers of the Association as provided in Article IV, and such other duties as may be from time to time assigned to them by the Association. There shall be such other committees as the president may appoint, or be instructed to appoint, by resolution of the Association.

## VI

There shall be an annual meeting of the Association at the time and place appointed by the executive committee.

## VII

The Association shall publish annually its proceedings to be known as *The Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association*. It shall contain the constitution, by-laws, and minutes of the annual meeting together with such papers and documents selected by the executive committee as may be published without incurring a deficit. It is understood that all papers read at the annual meeting become the property of the Association except as otherwise may be provided by the executive committee. The executive committee shall annually elect an editor of the *Proceedings*. He shall have authority to appoint an associate editor and shall be a member of the executive committee, but without vote.

## VIII

This constitution may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the members present at the annual business meeting.



## MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

ALEXANDER, THOMAS B.	Clemson, S. C.
<i>Assistant Professor of History and Government, Clemson College</i>	
BAKER, MARY NEEL	Greenwood, S. C.
<i>Greenwood High School</i>	
BLAKE, EUGENE H.	Greenwood, S. C.
BOYD, RUTH	Greenville, S. C.
<i>Greenville Senior High School</i>	
BREWSTER, LAWRENCE F.	Greenville, N. C.
<i>Professor of History, East Carolina Teachers College</i>	
CALHOUN, MRS. A. D.	Greenwood, S. C.
<i>Greenwood Elementary School</i>	
CALLCOTT, W. H.	Columbia, S. C.
<i>Professor of History, University of South Carolina</i>	
CARPENTER, C. H.	Clemson, S. C.
<i>Instructor of History and Government, Clemson College</i>	
CAUTHEN, CHARLES E.	Spartanburg, S. C.
<i>Professor of History, Wofford College</i>	
CHILDS, MRS. A. R.	Columbia, S. C.
<i>Professor of History, University of South Carolina</i>	
DANIEL, LUCIA	Columbia, S. C.
<i>University High School</i>	
DAVIDSON, ELIZABETH H.	Hartsville, S. C.
<i>Acting Head of History Department, Coker College</i>	
DAVIS, HENRY C.	Columbia, S. C.
<i>Professor of English Language, University of South Carolina</i>	
DESCHAMPS, MARGARET B.	Hartsville, S. C.
<i>Instructor of History, Coker College</i>	
DE TREVILLE, CATHERINE	Greenville, S. C.
<i>Greenville Senior High School</i>	
EASTERBY, J. H.	Charleston, S. C.
<i>Professor of History, College of Charleston</i>	
EASTWOOD, A. J.	Gaffney, S. C.
<i>Head of Department of History and Government, Limestone College</i>	
EPTING, CARL L.	Clemson, S. C.
<i>Associate Professor of History and Government, Clemson College</i>	
FERRELL, C. M.	Columbia, S. C.
<i>Professor of History, University of South Carolina</i>	
FOSTER, WILLIAM O.	Clinton, S. C.
<i>Head of History Department, Presbyterian College</i>	
GALLOWAY, HELEN BRICE	Greenville, S. C.
<i>Greenville Senior High School</i>	
GREEN, E. L.	Columbia, S. C.
<i>Professor of Ancient Languages, University of South Carolina</i>	
GREGORIE, ANNE KING	Mt. Pleasant, S. C.
HAGAN, HELEN	Hartsville, S. C.
<i>Librarian, Coker College</i>	
HATFIELD, G. ELLIOTT	Columbia, S. C.
<i>Head Department of History, Columbia College</i>	
HENNIG, MRS. JULIAN	Columbia, S. C.
HOLMES, A. G.	Clemson, S. C.
<i>Professor of History, Clemson College</i>	

JONES, EVELYN	Greenville Senior High School	Greenville, S. C.
JONES, LEWIS P.	Instructor of History, Wofford College	Spartanburg, S. C.
KIBLER, LILLIAN	Professor of History, Converse College	Spartanburg, S. C.
LANDER, ERNEST M., JR.	Assistant Professor of History and Government, Clemson College	Clemson, S. C.
LESESNE, J. M.	Professor of History, Erskine College	Due West, S. C.
LEWIS, ARCHIBALD R.	Associate Professor of History, University of South Carolina	Columbia, S. C.
MACAULAY, NEILL W.		Columbia, S. C.
McINTOSH, NANCY	Columbia High School	Columbia, S. C.
McSWAIN, DOROTHY	Columbia High School	Columbia, S. C.
MAULDIN, GUY E.		Washington, D. C.
MERIWETHER, R. L.	Professor of History, University of South Carolina	Columbia, S. C.
MOFFITT, JAMES W.	Associate Professor of History, Furman University	Greenville, S. C.
OCHS, ROBERT D.	Adjunct Professor of History, University of South Carolina	Columbia, S. C.
ODELL, A. T.	Professor of English, Furman University	Greenville, S. C.
OLIPHANT, MRS. ALBERT D. (MARY SIMMS)		Greenville, S. C.
PATTERSON, WILLIAM H.	Adjunct Professor of Engineering, University of South Carolina	Columbia, S. C.
PEARLSTINE, HANNA	Columbia High School	Columbia, S. C.
REAMES, J. MITCHELL	Library, Clemson College	Clemson, S. C.
RICE, HARVEY I., JR.	Instructor of History, College of Charleston	Charleston, S. C.
RICHARDS, JANE LEIGHTON	Professor of History and Dean of Students, Converse College	Spartanburg, S. C.
SIMS, HENRY R.	President, Winthrop College	Rock Hill, S. C.
SKARDON, A. W., JR.		Chicago, Illinois
SMITH, DOROTHY	Head of Division of Books and Periodicals, Caroliniana Library	Columbia, S. C.
SPAIN, MRS. FRANCIS LANDER	Librarian, Winthrop College	Rock Hill, S. C.
STONE, RICHARD G.	President, Saint Mary's School and Junior College	Raleigh, N. C.
TILGHMAN, MRS. H. L.		Marion, S. C.
TOWNSEND, LEAH		Florence, S. C.
TUTTLE, J. E.	Instructor of History and Government, Clemson College	Clemson, S. C.
VARN, SALLIE	Greenville Senior High School	Greenville, S. C.



- VENABLE, AUSTIN L. .... Rock Hill, S. C.  
*Head Department of History, Winthrop College*
- WALLACE, D. D. .... Spartanburg, S. C.  
*Professor of History, Wofford College*
- WARDLAW, FRANK H. .... Columbia, S. C.  
*Manager, University of South Carolina Press*
- WATSON, HARRY L. .... Greenwood, S. C.  
*Editor, The Index-Journal*
- WEBB, WILLIAM E. .... Clemson, S. C.  
*Instructor of History and Government, Clemson College*
- WIENEFELD, ROBERT H. .... Columbia, S. C.  
*Professor of History, University of South Carolina*
- WILKEN, HAZEL C. .... Charleston, S. C.  
*Rivers Junior High School*
- WILKES, M. R. .... Washington, D. C.
- WOLFE, J. HAROLD. .... Rock Hill, S. C.  
*Professor of History, Winthrop College*
- WOODY, ROBERT H. .... Durham, N. C.  
*Associate Professor of History, Duke University*

\_\_\_\_\_



*New!*

THE  
UNITED  
STATES

*EXPERIMENT IN DEMOCRACY*

By Avery Craven and Walter Johnson. An outstanding chronicle of American history that describes the crystallization of an ideal of government. Planned for freshman or sophomore college classes, the book concentrates on the major topics in American development—the rise of democratic thought, nationalism, economic and social growth, literature and cultural trends. Major emphasis is placed on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and on the United States as a world power. The United States is an unusually interesting, well-integrated book, notable for its vivid style and striking illustrations.

GINN AND COMPANY, 260 Fifth Street, San Francisco 3





